

REPORT TO THE MEETING OF COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW COMMITTEE ON 8th DECEMBER 2020

Meeting: Community Governance Review Committee

Date: 8th December 2020

Subject: Recommendations to Council

Report Of: Richard Ellis, Corporate Services Manager

Portfolio Holder: Councillor Dann

Status: For Consideration

Relevant Ward(s): All

1 Purpose of Report

- 1.1 To provide the Community Governance Review Committee with a summary of the responses received during the consultation period on the draft recommendations.
- 1.2 To enable the Committee to agree final recommendations for submission to Council for consideration at its meeting on 25th January 2021.

2 Recommendations:

- 2.1 That the number of parish councillors for Claybrooke Magna Parish Council be increased from 5 to 6 to take effect from the next full parish council elections.
- 2.2 That the number of parish councillors for Husbands Bosworth Parish Council be increased from 6 to 7 to take effect from the date of the next full parish council elections.
- 2.3 That subject to the accurate capture of the new boundary line to the edge of the Strategic Development Area and other relevant spatial features that the Lubenham parish boundary be amended to the line depicted in orange on the plan Appendix C6 attached to this report to come into effect from the next full parish council elections.
- 2.4 That the parish boundary between Kibworth Harcourt and Kibworth Beauchamp be amended to follow the green line on plan Appendix D attached to this report to come into effect from the next full parish council elections.

- 2.5 That the parish boundary between Fleckney and Saddington be amended to follow the green line on plan Appendix E.1 attached to this report to come into effect from the next full parish council elections.**
- 2.6 That no action be taken on the proposal to alter the parish boundary between East Langton and West Langton and that it remains as existing.**
- 2.7 That no action be taken on the proposal to alter the parish boundary between Tur Langton and East Langton and that it remains as existing.**
- 2.8 That the parish warding be removed from Thurnby and Bushby Parish Council and that the Parish Council retains 10 councillors.**

3 Summary of Reasons for the Recommendations

- 3.1 The draft recommendations approved by Council have been subject to public consultation between 1st October and 30th November 2020. Section 5 of this report sets out the responses received and the areas for consideration. The final recommendations follow government guidance on carrying out Community Governance Reviews and the matters that should be taken into consideration.
- 3.2 Community governance reviews provide the opportunity for principal councils to review and make changes to community governance within their areas. It can be helpful to undertake community governance reviews in circumstances such as where there have been changes in population, or in reaction to specific or local new issues.
- 3.3 In many cases making changes to the boundaries of existing parishes, rather than creating an entirely new parish, will be sufficient to ensure that community governance arrangements to continue to reflect local identities and facilitate effective and convenient local government. For example, over time communities may expand with new housing developments. This can often lead to existing parish boundaries becoming anomalous as new houses are built across the boundaries resulting in people being in different parishes from their neighbours. In such circumstances, the council should consider undertaking a community governance review, the terms of reference of which should include consideration of the boundaries of existing parishes.
- 3.4 A review of parish boundaries is an opportunity to put in place strong boundaries, tied to firm ground detail, and remove anomalous parish boundaries. Since the new boundaries are likely to be used to provide the building blocks for district ward, London borough ward, county division and parliamentary constituency boundaries in future reviews for such councils, it is important that principal councils seek to address parish boundary issues at regular intervals.
- 3.5 Ultimately, the recommendations made in a community governance review ought to bring about improved community engagement, better local

democracy, and result in more effective and convenient delivery of local services.

- 3.6 The changes to parish boundaries would only impact on parish electoral arrangements and would not change district wards, county divisions or parliamentary boundaries (these being the responsibility of the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (district and county) and Boundary Commission for England (parliamentary)). However, any changes made to parish boundaries by the District Council would be considered as part of any future reviews of these areas.

4 Impact on Communities

- 4.1 Community governance reviews provide the opportunity for principal authorities to review and make changes to community governance arrangements in their areas to reflect local circumstances, for example, in relation to changes in population or in reaction to specific or local issues. The provisions of the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007, which devolved powers to carry out and implement reviews to principal councils, are intended to improve the development and coordination of support for citizens and community groups so that they can make the best use of empowerment opportunities

5 Key Facts

5.1 **Claybrooke Magna** (council size)

Draft recommendation

It is recommended that the number of parish councillors for Claybrooke Magna Parish Council be increased from 5 to 6 to take effect from the date of the next full parish council elections.

Response to consultation

None

Matters for consideration

This proposal was submitted by the parish council and is considered acceptable considering the size of parish councils with similar electorates within the district.

Final recommendation

That the number of parish councillors for Claybrooke Magna Parish Council be increased from 5 to 6 to take effect from the next full parish council elections.

5.2 **Husbands Bosworth** (council size)

Draft recommendation

It is recommended that the number of parish councillors for Husbands Bosworth Parish Council be increased from 6 to 7 to take effect from the date of the next full parish council elections.

Response to consultation

None

Matters for consideration

This proposal was submitted by the parish council and is considered acceptable considering the size of parish councils with similar electorates within the district.

Final recommendation

That the number of parish councillors for Husbands Bosworth Parish Council be increased from 6 to 7 to take effect from the date of the next full parish council elections.

5.3 **Lubenham/Market Harborough** (parish boundary)

Draft recommendation

It is recommended that the Council supports in principle the alteration of the Lubenham parish boundary as requested by the parish council and consults with the parish council, developers and residents on Option C shown on the plan attached as Appendix C.6.

Response to consultation

Market Harborough Civic Society:

Thank you for your letter dated 1st October regarding the above. The Civic Society are pleased that the Council has agreed that the area allocated for new development should be moved to Market Harborough Parish from Lubenham. We also agree with the boundary shown on Appendix C6 which takes in the housing sites, the industrial sites, and the showground at Airfield Farm. The plan also takes account of any little anomalies created by the old boundary.

We also asked Harborough to consider creating a Town Council for Market Harborough. We are aware that this option was not reviewed this time. Can you let us know when a review is likely to take place as we feel the need is greater than ever?

Residents:

1 letter raising no objection:

“My husband & I do not object to the revised parish boundary from Lubenham parish to the unparished area of Market Harborough.”

2 letters supporting the proposal:

“I reside at Roberts Close Market Harborough along with my husband, we support the change of parish boundary from Lubenham to the unparished area of Market Harborough i.e. option C on the governance review. I should appreciate it if you could explain what is meant by ‘unparished area’. I assume this means we come within Market Harborough District Council but would appreciate confirmation.”

“My family and I support the proposals in the draft recommendations regarding the proposed alteration to the Lubenham parish boundary” (residents of Guiver Drive).

Matters for consideration

No objections to the proposal have been received during the consultation period. The Chair of Lubenham Parish Council raised verbal concerns regarding inclusion of the showground site on the basis that it may impact their influence on any events which may be planned there and enforcement of planning conditions. No formal response has been received.

The inductive revised boundary line (the orange line on plan Appendix C6) has been captured by digitising plans taken from the approved planning applications and developers master plans, as well as the area of separation contained in the Lubenham Neighbourhood Plan. The plans show the general line proposed but are not entirely 100% accurate as the site is at such a large scale and some parts of the boundary have no corresponding line on an Ordnance Survey map (bisecting a field for example) . As the development progresses and the maps are updated by the Ordnance Survey the precise position will become clear. This will be dictated by the edge of the currently approved residential development. In the meantime, Officers will seek to obtain suitable GIS files from developers (who will have access to survey information) in order that the line can be plotted as accurately as possible for inclusion in the re-organisation order. The orange line captures the extent of the area impacted in sufficient detail to clearly identify all land and buildings which will no longer be within the parish of Lubenham should this recommendation be approved.

Final recommendation

That subject to the accurate capture of the new boundary line to the edge of the Strategic Development Area and other relevant spatial features that the Lubenham parish boundary be amended to the line depicted in orange on the plan Appendix C6 attached to this report to come into effect from the next full parish council elections.

5.4 **Kibworth Harcourt/Kibworth Beauchamp** (parish boundary)

Draft recommendation

It is recommended that consultation be undertaken with both parishes, and residents of properties located within the area concerned on the proposal to amend the parish boundary as indicated on the plan at Appendix D.

Response to consultation

Kibworth Beauchamp Parish Council: Supports

“Just to advise that we discussed this at our Parish Meeting on 27 October and it was resolved to agree this. No further comments.”

Ward councillor (King): Supports

“I fully support the recommendations in the report as approved at Council.”

Residents: 4 letters supporting the proposal

“Thanks for your letter and map – re the change from Beauchamp to Harcourt. To be honest thought Bush Road was Harcourt. I would fully support the changeover to Harcourt – if you need further information/support from myself – please let me know.”

“We write to you in response to your letter regarding the proposal to amend the Kibworth Harcourt/ Kibworth Beauchamp boundary with particular respect to properties on Barnards Way, Bush Road and Longbreach Road, which would locate those properties within Kibworth Harcourt. We are fully in support of this proposal to locate Longbreach Road within the parish of Kibworth Harcourt. We live in a property on Longbreach Road, which we purchased in October 2014. At the time of completion we were informed that our address was: *nn* Longbreach Road, Kibworth Harcourt, Leicestershire, LE8 0SQ and this was the formal address registered with the Royal Mail for the post code and was used for our property deeds. All our legal documentation for: property, identification, banking, utilities, services, and general communication use this address, as does the letter you sent us. We believe that we have been living in Kibworth Harcourt and do not want that state changed. To do so would cause significant confusion and expense with the multitude of administrative organisations that interact with the various facets of our daily lives. Indeed, it is likely that this would have the same effect upon all the other residents of Longbreach Road and possibly Barnards Way and Bush Road as well, which would compound the problems. It would make good sense to leave our addresses as they are, by actioning your proposal.”

“It seems to us that logically, looking at the map enclosed with your letter of the 5th October, the properties on Barnards Way, Longbreach Road and Bush Road should be included within Kibworth Harcourt. We would however suggest that the whole should be known as one or the other or simply Kibworth which would mean one parish council. This might contribute to a sense of one community. Perhaps a local referendum might be a good idea.”

“We are happy with the proposal for the outlined properties to be part of Kibworth Harcourt.”

Matters for consideration

This proposed change to the parish boundary was put forward with the support of both parish councils. The parish boundary between Harcourt and Beauchamp does not follow any clearly identifiable line here and the proposed change will bring an end to local confusion caused by properties within the area affected (currently within the parish of Kibworth Beauchamp) having Harcourt postal addresses. The proposal makes use of the railway line to draw a clear distinction between Beauchamp and Harcourt in this area.

Final recommendation

That the parish boundary between Kibworth Harcourt and Kibworth Beauchamp be amended to follow the green line on plan Appendix D attached to this report to come into effect from the next full parish council elections.

5.5 **Saddington/Fleckney** (parish boundary)

Draft recommendation

It is recommended that consultation be undertaken with both parishes, and residents of properties located within the area concerned on the proposal to amend the parish boundary as indicated on the plan at Appendix E.1.

Response to consultation

Saddington Parish Meeting:

I refer to your consultation letter dated 1st October 2020 regarding HDC's draft recommendation to relocate the parish boundary between Saddington and Fleckney, such that all the properties which form part of the 'Appleyard Park' development and which are currently located in Saddington parish would become located within the extended parish of Fleckney. Appendix E.2 to your letter (as included in Annex-1 to this letter) illustrates the current parish boundary shown in red, and the proposed relocated parish boundary shown in green. Saddington Parish Meeting's response to the consultation is as follows: 1. Saddington Parish Meeting did not agree with the planning decision to allow the construction and unilateral imposition of 150 new houses in Saddington Parish, and in the Saddington Neighbourhood Area, adjacent to the parish boundary with Fleckney parish. We would have preferred not to have such an imposition which clearly has challenged the identity and civic association of those houses, and as we predicted during the planning process now retrospectively raises a question as to the appropriate route of the parish boundary. 2. Saddington Parish Meeting recognises that we cannot change the past, but we wish to record that we do not accept that moving the parish boundary to solve a problem created by a planning decision should ever be considered a foregone conclusion. Having said that, based on the current situation Saddington Parish Meeting's pragmatic position is that if the

'Appleyard Park' houses are to be considered part of Fleckney settlement then Saddington Parish Meeting does not object to the proposal to move the Saddington / Fleckney parish boundary as indicated by the green line in your appendix E.2. 3. Please note that the Neighbourhood Area for Saddington's Neighbourhood Plan (as shown in Annex-2 to this letter) was designated in July 2016, and Saddington's Neighbourhood Area currently follows the parish boundary between Saddington and Fleckney. If the proposed relocation of the parish boundary is implemented then Saddington Neighbourhood Forum and Fleckney Parish Council will both need to consider whether changes are required to their designated Neighbourhood Areas to align with the revised parish boundary.

Residents:

2 Letters of support:

"I have just read the article contained within the Fleckney Communicata concerning the boundary. I have been a resident of Fleckney for 50+ years and my ancestors long before this. I currently live on The Meer which happens to be close to the Appleyard Park. It is my opinion that it would be ridiculous to split the development in to the 2 different parishes. This would be confusing for all and especially the residents of Appleyard Park. The existing boundary was set many years ago and isn't relevant any longer. I support the change in boundary to include all of Appleyard Park. However, that should be that, the boundary towards Saddington reset and stuck to once and for all. In summary I support HDC on this matter."

"I am writing in support of the proposal to increase the size of Fleckney by moving the parish boundary between Fleckney and Saddington to incorporate the whole of the Appleyard Park development. This is a sensible proposal because the development lies two thirds within the parish of Saddington and one third in the parish boundary of Fleckney but is entirely contiguous with the Fleckney built up area. Residents of the development will use the facilities of Fleckney rather than Saddington which has no shops, school, doctors, dentist, or sports centre. Extending the Fleckney parish boundary would give physical coherence because the built-up area would form one continuous parish area. The extension of the parish boundary to incorporate the increased population will be of significant advantage to Fleckney parish in terms an increase in council tax income for the Parish Council and a better opportunity of attracting grant funding for further extensions of amenities to serve the larger population. If the parish boundary is not extended, then those seeking to be married in Fleckney Church will have to get extra legal permissions at great inconvenience and unnecessary cost. The Fleckney Communicata (the local village community magazine) incorrectly stated that the Parish Council were against this action. I am assured that this is not the case and that on the contrary the Parish Council fully supports the proposal to extend the Fleckney Parish boundary. I am very grateful to Harborough District Council for making this proposal which will be very beneficial for my parishioners and for the whole Parish of Fleckney."

7 letters objecting:

“Fleckney parish boundary has been in existence for many years with longstanding field and are boundaries within it. I can see no justification in extending this boundary to encompass part of the housing estate known as apple yard park currently under construction by Persimmon development company. As I understand it the bulk of the new housing is under the auspices of Saddington parish and they chose to place this development at their boundary edge. I can see no reason why Fleckney parish should in future be responsible for these extra houses whose construction was objected to at the planning stage. If anything , it would be more fitting that saddington were to have their boundary extended to encompass the whole of this development and take responsibility for all the housing which they have allotted to their new homes quota. I feel most strongly about this issue and would like my feelings noted.”

“The proposed plan to extend the village boundary of Fleckney. This is probably not the form I need to fill in but it was not easy to find the correct one on your web page. I would like to strongly object to this plan Village boundaries are being changed to accommodate new housing estates, and if are allowed to be changed eventually Saddington and Fleckney will be joined up. The village doesn't need to be extended anymore. Thank you for listening.”

“I wish to register my objection to the proposed change to the parish boundary between Fleckney and Saddington. There appears to be no valid reason or rationale to change an arrangement that has been in place since records began, other than to fit in with the poor planning decision made by HDC that has resulted in part of the new Persimmon housing development being located in the neighbouring parish of Saddington. This spurious boundary change could have been avoided if HDC's Planning team had considered the issue properly as part of the planning process instead of attempting to correct it retrospectively. Allowing this unnecessary change to take place will probably simply open the door to yet more unwanted development in Fleckney.”

“What a ridiculous idea this is! Moving something that's been in place since records began, for what? No reason is available. Why? Why'd we want to increase the size of an ever increasing village yet further? The boundary should stay where it currently is. More questions than answers! This is my official notification of objection to this ridiculous proposal.”

“I feel by extending the parish boundary of Fleckney towards Saddington would encourage more building within our village. We have already lost fields and hedgerows due to persimmon houses and other builders within Fleckney . I totally disagree with the proposal and think that the village should stay as it is.”

“Were the planning officers who approved the Persimmon housing development off Saddington Road not aware that the majority of these houses would lie within the Saddington parish? I feel it is setting a very dangerous

precedent to augment the size of one parish seemingly for the purpose of 'tidying up' a housing development. Where will this end. I am already aware that the permitted building line for development within the parish seems to have elastic qualities for the purpose of allowing more and more houses. Surely these boundaries were determined historically for a valid reason? I strongly object to this proposal for the above reason."

"HDC approved the development in the Saddington area on the Saddington Road, but adjoining Fleckney. Let it remain as ' Little Saddington' There was opposition from Fleckney community, --yet more green fields lost forever, and an attempt by HDC to cover up their error.

Matters for consideration

The proposal to amend the parish boundary was put forward by Fleckney Parish Council and Saddington Parish Meeting has raised no objection to the proposal subject to the revised parish boundary being closely tied to the extent of the new residential development.

An article was published in the last edition of the local village magazine, the 'Fleckney Communicata' suggesting that the Parish Council does not support the proposal with an editorial claiming that there was no justification to extend the village boundary which 'has been in place since records began'. It went on to provide information on how to object.

This has been taken up with the parish council and the author of the article and a correction has been promised for the next edition of the magazine. Unfortunately, this correction is unlikely too be published until after the close of consultation on the 30th November as it will appear in the December edition.

Whilst the parish boundary is historic the point of carrying out a review is to consider instances where these historic boundaries have been overtaken by more recent events and are no longer appropriate. In this instance the 'Appleyard Park' development has planning approval (approved on appeal) and is under construction. The development is part in the parish of Fleckney and part in the parish of Saddington but is an extension of the village of Fleckney. If it accepted that the new dwellings within the 'Saddington' part of the development are more logically associated with the village of Fleckney (to which they are attached) then a revision to the parish boundary in this area would regularise this anomaly.

Final recommendation

That the parish boundary between Fleckney and Saddington be amended to follow the green line on plan Appendix E.1 attached to this report to come into effect from the next full parish council elections.

5.6 East Langton/West Langton (parish boundary)

Draft recommendation

It is recommended that consultation be undertaken with West Langton Parish Meeting, East Langton Parish Council and the occupiers of the properties

contained within the area outlined by a green line on the attached plan (Appendix F) prior to finalising a recommendation in respect of this change.

Response to consultation

East Langton Parish Council: Supports

Residents:

1 letter objecting:

“In reference to our phone call yesterday I would like to advise you in writing of my concerns.

I refer to the map in question dated 21/08/2020, appendix F. Highlighted in green there was originally 3 dwellings, 2 farms with barns and outbuildings and in between the farms a crofters house which dates back to the 16th century. This is part of the West Langton parish and part of the domain of the West Langton Hall, this still has curtilage on the field in question. The properties over the years have changed and some of the outbuildings have been turned into dwellings with a new build added on to Home Farm, which own the fields in question.

My concern is, will this proposal weaken or destroy the curtilage on this renowned area famous for its heritage and history. West Langton does not hold recognised meetings and therefore I cannot object. I would like to make it known that I therefore do object to this proposal and would like the area to remain the same.”

Matters for consideration

The parish boundary in this location is long established and unlike other areas has not been subject to a substantial amount of new development in recent years. An objection has been raised to the proposal from a resident of one of the properties located within the area concerned objecting to the proposal on the grounds of the historic association with the parish of West Langton. The resident points out that there has been no parish meeting held in West Langton at which they were able to express their concerns.

The resident clearly associates themselves with the parish of West Langton and in the absence of a written response from any of the other properties within the area (letters of consultation were sent to eight properties) it is considered that on balance there is not sufficient evidence to recommend changing the boundary. The existing boundary in this area is formed by the road which is a clearly identifiable dividing line.

Final recommendation

That no action be taken on the proposal to alter the parish boundary between East Langton and West Langton and that it remains as existing.

5.7 **Tur Langton/East Langton** (parish boundary)

Draft recommendation

It is recommended that consultation be undertaken with Tur Langton and East Langton parish councils and residents of the properties concerned on the proposed realignment of the parish boundary around the properties indicated on the plan attached as Appendix G.

Response to consultation

East Langton Parish Council: Supports

Tur Langton Parish Council: Supports

Residents:

“Thanks for your letter re changing this property to East Langton parish. I have no preference on this. My only comment is the boundary is dictated by the brook which is a good natural line for the boundary. Stepping the line out and round this property seems counter intuitive. This is the only household here.”

Matters for consideration

There occupier of Barn Owl Hollow has confirmed that there is only one property in this location and points to the fact that the brook forms a natural boundary in this location (field boundary). The current boundary appears logical in this area and forms an easily identifiable boundary. The occupier of the only residential property has not indicated any preference or association with Church Langton and it is not therefore considered appropriate to recommend making any change to the existing parish boundary.

Final recommendation

That no action be taken on the proposal to alter the parish boundary between Tur Langton and East Langton and that it remains as existing.

5.8 **Thurnby and Bushby** (warding)

Draft recommendation

It is recommended that the warding be removed from the parish of Thurnby and Bushby and that council size is set at 10 councillors based on the parish boundary to take effect from the date of the next full parish council elections.

Response to consultation

Thurnby and Bushby Parish Council: Supports

“It was noted that the outcomes of the review are out for consultation, including the recommendation that Thurnby and Bushby retain a membership of 10 Councillors, but that the two wards be merged. The changes are out for consultation and if approved will come into effect from the next local council elections. It was agreed to support the recommendations.”

Matter for consideration

New residential development within the parish means that the existing warding arrangements are no longer reflective of the population as the electorate has increased within 'Bushby' (represented by 3 parish councillors) in relation to 'Thurnby' (represented by 7 parish councillors). The boundary between Thurnby and Bushby is not obvious and new development on or across the boundary makes it hard to identify. The Parish Council has requested that the warding be removed and that the number of parish councillors remains at 10 representing the whole parish.

Final recommendation

That the parish warding be removed from Thurnby and Bushby Parish Council and that the Parish Council retains 10 councillors.

5.9 **East Langton** (parish name)

Draft recommendation

It is recommended that the parish of East Langton remains unwarded, but that consultation be carried out with the parish council on re-naming the parish to reflect both East Langton and Church Langton within the name.

Response to consultation

East Langton Parish Council:

"East Langton Parish Name – East Langton Parish Council does not support the proposal that the parish council should be renamed. The name of East Langton Parish Council is historic and the council is happy with it."

Matters for consideration

East Langton parish council has indicated that it does not wish to change the name of the parish council.

Final recommendation

As the parish council does not wish to pursue changing the name no recommendations are made and the name remains 'East Langton Parish Council'

6.0 Legal Issues

- 6.1 The power to undertake Community Governance Reviews is provided to the District Council as a principal authority under the provisions of the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 (sections 79-102). It can make changes to parish governance arrangements including parish status (council, meeting or unparished), parish council size (number of councillors) and parish boundaries. It can also agree grouping and ungrouping in appropriate circumstances.

6.2 Any agreed changes will need to be implemented through completion of a Reorganisation of Community Governance Order under seal. Any changes agreed to parish boundaries will not change any related district ward, county division or parliamentary boundary. Reviews of district wards and county divisions are undertaken by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) and reviews of parliamentary constituency boundaries by the Boundary Commission for England (BCE).

6.3 Approved neighbourhood plan boundaries cannot be changed but do not have to be co-terminus with other boundaries (including parish boundaries). Any changes to parish boundaries agreed through the Community Governance Review would not change any approved neighbourhood plan areas and the policies in any approved or emerging plan would continue to apply to the former or new parish area until such time as the neighbourhood plan is reviewed. There would need to be some co-ordination of the review process to facilitate this, but this should not prevent any changes to parish boundaries that would facilitate more effective and appropriate local governance arrangements from taking place.

7 Resource Issues

7.1 The review has been provided for in the Corporate Services team plan and will be undertaken within existing resources.

8 Equality Implications

8.1 The review is aimed at ensuring that parish governance arrangements best meet the needs of the local area.

9 Impact on the Organisation

9.1 Any changes to parish boundaries will need to be reflected in services delivered by the District Council where these rely on those boundaries (services such as elections and council tax).

9.2 Changes to parish boundaries do not change other administrative boundaries (district wards, county divisions and parliamentary constituencies) but will be considered in any future reviews of these areas by the relevant boundary commission.

10 Community Safety Implications

10.1 No implications identified.

11. Carbon Management Implications

11.1 No implications identified.

12. Risk Management Implications

12.1 No implications identified.

13 Consultation

13.1 The consultation period on the draft recommendations agreed by Council ran from 1st October to 30th November 2020. The draft recommendations were publicised on the Councils website and the following bodies/individuals were consulted directly:

- Parish councils and parish meetings directly impacted by the proposals
- Individual consultation letters to properties subject to a proposed parish boundary change (where it was possible to verify occupancy)
- Developers of housing sites affected by the proposals
- Leicestershire County Council
- District Councillors for wards affected by the proposals
- County Councillors for divisions affected by the proposals
- Local Members of Parliament
- The Leicestershire and Rutland Association of Parish and Local Councils
- Market Harborough Civic Society

13.2 A letter was sent to all parish councils and parish meetings advising them of the proposals.

14 Options Considered

14.1 Not to undertake a district wide review. It is considered that a district wide review is the most appropriate option to ensure that a consistency in approach to parish governance and to meet the expectation that the Council will keep community governance arrangements under periodic review.

15 Background Papers

15.1 Guidance on community governance reviews (DCLG and LGBCE)
March 2010

Previous report(s): *Council 23rd September 2019 – Community Governance Review*

Community Governance Review Committee 22nd October 2019

Community Governance Review Committee 19th August 2020

**Community Governance Review Committee 9th
September 2020**

Council 28th September 2020

Information Issued Under Sensitive Issue Procedure: N

Ward Members Notified: Y

Appendices:

Appendix C.6	Lubenham Option C
Appendix D	Kibworths parish boundary
Appendix E.1	Fleckney and Saddington
Appendix F	East Langton/West Langton
Appendix G	Tur Langton/East Langton